

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants submit this Amendment and Response to the Office Action dated July 14, 2005. Claims 1, 3, and 27 have been amended as outlined herein. Accordingly, Claims 1-3 and 20-37 are now pending in the application.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the “high-pressure hose” claim limitation. Claim 3 thus has been amended to change “high-pressure hose” to “high-pressure fluid delivery line.” Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to Claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 20, 21, and 27-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,571,805 to Hoenisch et al. (“Hoenisch”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0002500 to Kasen et al. (“Kasen”). Furthermore, Claims 22-26 and 33-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoenisch and Kasen in view of either U.S. Patent No. 5,221,026 to Williams (“Williams”) or U.S. Patent No. 6,705,332 to Field et al. (“Field”). In order to support a prima facie case of obviousness there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the references or to combine the reference teachings, there must be a reasonable expectation of success, and the prior art reference or references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *MPEP* §2143. However, all of the claim limitations set forth in the pending claims are not found in any of the above mentioned references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is generally directed to a cleaning machine. As amended, Claim 1 recites in part, “the amount of each fluid entering the at least two fluid inlets of the selector are selectively adjustable.” Support for the claim amendments can be found in the specification, for example on page 7, lines 16-18. Neither Hoenisch, Kasen, Williams, nor Field teach a system wherein the amounts of at least two cleaning fluids can varied. Specifically, Hoenisch teaches away from such a selective mixture of cleaning fluids, wherein a system is disclosed where cleaning fluids are selected in a binary fashion, meaning either they are completely selected or they are not. In column 7, line 53-60, Hoenisch teaches, “the valve being adjustable to selectively place one of the first, second, and third containers in fluid flow communication with the mixing device.” Furthermore,

Kasen, Williams, and Field also fail to teach, suggest, or describe a system where the amount of cleaning fluids used can be selectively adjusted. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2, 3, and 20-26 are not obvious in view of any of the above cited references, and the rejections of Claim 1 and the dependent claims therefrom should be reconsidered and withdrawn.


Claim 27 has been amended to correct a minor grammatical error. Applicants also respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claim 27 as being obvious over Hoenisch in view of Kasen. More specifically, Claim 27 includes a limitation involving a mixing means and a metering means, wherein the metering means is "adapted to selectively alter the ratio of fluids in the first cleaning solution storage means and the second cleaning solution storage means." Also, Claim 27 includes a fluid storage means, a first cleaning solution storage means, and a second cleaning solution storage means. Neither Hoenisch nor Kasen teach, suggest, or describe a cleaning machine that has a metering means that is adapted to selectively alter the ratio of fluids. The selective altering of cleaning fluid ratios allows the user of the claimed invention to create various strengths and types of cleaning fluids with relative ease compared to the prior art. As stated above, Hoenisch teaches a system where the cleaning solutions must be selected one at a time and the relative amounts of each cleaning solution cannot be controlled. Also, Kasen does not teach, suggest, or describe a system where the ratio of cleaning fluids is adjustable. In fact, Kasen only describes a system where one cleaning fluid is used. Kasen does not describe a machine that has a fluid storage means, a first cleaning solution means, and a second cleaning solution storage means. Additionally, Williams and Field fail to teach, suggest, or describe a machine that has a fluid storage means, a first cleaning solution means, and a second cleaning solution storage means. They also fail to teach suggest, or describe a machine where the ratio of fluids in the first cleaning solution storage means and the second cleaning solutions storage means can be selectively altered. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 27 and dependent Claims 28-37 are not obvious in view of any of the above mentioned references, and the rejections of Claim 27 and the dependent claims therefrom should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

*Application No. 10/737,027*

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By:   
Matthew R. Ellsworth  
Registration No. 56,345  
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200  
Denver, Colorado 80202-5141  
(303) 863-9700

Date: September 28, 2005